



Grants for Peer Review and Mentoring for the 2016 - 2017 Year

Information for Applicants

Grant Purpose and Information.....	page 2-3
Application Process.....	page 4-5
Rubric for Review of Applications	page 6-7

PEER REVIEW AND MENTORING GRANT 2016-2017

Purpose

Research studies continue to substantiate that a solid mentoring support system for educators new to the profession will lead to greater retention in the field. The U.S. Department of Education's Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study found that first-year teachers who were not assigned a mentor were twice as likely as teachers with a mentor to leave the profession within their first five years (see <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>).

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant (PRMG) program, authorized through [Wis. Stat. § 115.405](#) and governed by [Wisconsin Administrative Rule PI 38](#), provides financial assistance for Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) and districts to provide peer review and mentoring support for Wisconsin Initial Educators. The 2015-2017 state budget provides \$1,606,700 in each year of the biennium to be awarded on a competitive basis to CESAs, consortia of districts, consortia of CESAs, and consortia of CESAs and districts.

Wisconsin Initial Educator Support System

To support initial educators, Wisconsin school districts per [PI 34.17 \(2\)](#) are required to provide ongoing orientation, support seminars and qualified mentors for all initial educators within their districts. In addition, districts per [PI 34.17 \(3\)](#) must designate a Wisconsin DPI trained administrator to be available to serve on the initial educator's Professional Development Plan (PDP) team. Further, institutions of higher education per [PI 34.17 \(3\)](#) must also designate representatives to be trained and to be available to serve on the initial educator's PDP team. This provides a connection from pre-serve to in-serve within the performance based system.

Definitions

In Wisconsin, an “**Initial Educator**” means an individual who has successfully completed for the first time an approved educator preparation program in the teacher, administrator, or pupil services professional category after August 31, 2004 as per [PI 34.01 \(23\)](#).

To help ensure that initial educators in Wisconsin receive the support they need to become effective, professional educators, Wisconsin Administrative Rule [PI 34.17 \(2\)](#) requires school districts to provide initial educators with support and a qualified mentor. The specific requirements are:

- a) The initial educator shall receive **ongoing orientation** from the employing school district which is collaboratively developed and delivered by school boards, administrators, teachers, support staff and parents.
- b) The initial educator shall be provided **support seminars** by the employing school district which reflect the Wisconsin Teacher, Administrator, or Pupil Services Standards (<http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/programs/standards>) and the mission and goals of the school district.
- c) The initial educator shall be provided with a **qualified mentor** by the employing school district. The mentoring period may be for less than 5 years.

“Mentor” means an educator who is trained to provide support and assistance to initial educators and who will have input into the confidential formative assessment of the initial educator and who is not to be considered as part of the formal employment evaluation process, per [PI 34.01\(34\)](#) and [PI 38.04](#).

“Qualified” means the person holds an appropriate license as per [PI 34.01 \(47\)](#).

Peer Review is the confidential formative assessment provided to initial educators by peers outside of their formal evaluation. As per the definition of mentor, peer review can occur by the mentor. In the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, some districts may be using effectiveness coaches for peer review. Additional information on peer review can be found within the guidance for effectiveness coaches available here: <http://dpi.wi.gov/ee/teacher/evaluators-coaches/coaches>.

Wisconsin Equity Plan

In the Wisconsin Teacher Equitable Access Plan, which is required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended (see <http://dpi.wi.gov/wi-equity-plan>), Wisconsin has defined **“inexperienced teachers”** as those within their first three years of teaching. Wisconsin defines **“unqualified teachers”** as those teachers of record who have not completed an approved educator preparation program and are teaching on an emergency permit or teachers teaching out-of-field on an emergency license. That is, emergency credentialed teachers are considered unqualified within the plan. The plan addresses state strategies to eliminate the inequitable distribution of inexperienced or unqualified teachers working in schools with high enrollments of students of color and/or poverty. In Wisconsin, nine (9) school districts have been identified as having the greatest need to reduce inequitable distribution of inexperienced initial educators or unqualified educators (Beloit, Green Bay, Janesville, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, Waukesha, and West Allis-West Milwaukee).

Priority Area

The DPI is using the PRMG program as one strategy in the Wisconsin Teacher Equitable Access Plan for ensuring that schools with an inequitable distribution of inexperienced or unqualified teachers have access to funds to provide additional support through peer review and mentoring to these educators. Priority will be given to proposals that include the nine (9) targeted districts.

Available Award Amounts

Each consortium/applicant is eligible for a grant not to exceed \$25,000. These grants are for one (1) year only and funds must be encumbered by June 30, 2017. No carryover funds are allowed. Activities within the proposal may have occurred beginning July 1, 2016.

Matching Funds

As a condition of receiving a grant, a CESA or a consortium shall provide matching funds in an amount equal to at least 20% of the amount of the grant awarded. The matching funds may be in the form of money, in-kind services, or both. The 20% match may come from local funds or federal funds, such as Title II A.

Application Process

A. Grant Period

Grant applications are due in our office by June 30, 2016. Approved consortia may begin to be expend grant funds beginning July 1, 2016; however, all expenditures are contingent upon the approval of the grant application. The grant period ends June 30, 2017.

Application materials are available on the DPI website:

<http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/programs/prmg>.

B. Fundable Activities

Funds must be used to support induction, mentoring, and peer review activities for initial educators (i.e., teachers, administrators, and pupil services professionals); for professional educators to work with initial educators; and for the purpose of expanding current practices for peer review and mentoring, encouraging experimental or pilot programs, and improving the inequitable distribution of inexperienced or unqualified educators. Priority will be given to proposals that include the following:

- Provide peer review and mentoring support to inexperienced (first three years of teaching) initial educators in one or more of the nine districts identified in Wisconsin's Teacher Equitable Access Plan (Beloit, Green Bay, Janesville, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, Waukesha, and West Allis-West Milwaukee);
- Provide mentoring support to unqualified (emergency license/permit holders) who are serving as teachers of record and working toward full licensure;
- Provide support, training, and professional development for mentors of initial educators to learn and complete the Professional Development Plan (PDP) process;
- Provide support to educators in utilizing the results of Educator Effectiveness Plans (EEP) to inform (align) the development of PDP and vice versa;
- Provide support for school districts and mentors to assist initial educators in completing the PDP process and/or licensure process;
- Provide support seminars based on district needs in the form of regional professional learning communities;
- Provide training to mentors to provide support and assistance to initial educators through confidential formative assessment;
- Provide training for administrators at the professional educator level to serve as mentors for initial educator administrators;
- Provide training for pupil service professionals at the professional educator level to serve as mentors for initial educator pupil service professionals;
- An identified peer review and mentoring need that is demonstrated through student and/or staff data.

C. Application Timeline

June 30, 2016: Application due
July, 2016: Notification of grant award
July 1, 2016: Grant start date
May 31, 2017: Final day for budget modifications
June 30, 2017: Grant end date
August 5, 2017: End-of-Year Report due
September 30, 2017: Final claim due

Financial Requirements

Grant recipients shall adhere to the guidelines set by the Wisconsin Uniform Financial Account Requirements (WUFAR). Information about WUFAR is available on the DPI's website at <http://dpi.wi.gov/sfs/finances/wufar/overview>. The DPI encourages applicants to contact their business manager for assistance with the budget portion of the application. Grant recipients must also follow the guidelines set forth in the Financial Management Handbook for Federal and State Grant Programs, which is available at http://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/sms/doc/fhndbook_2013.doc.

Payment of Grant Funds

Grant funds must be encumbered by June 30, 2017. A final program fiscal report is due no later than September 30, 2017. Grant recipients must spend funds during the grant year. The option to carry over funds to the next fiscal year is not allowed.

Budget Modifications

If a grant recipient determines that a modification to the original approved budget is necessary, the grant recipient shall request review and approval from the DPI. The grant recipient shall not expend funds until the DPI approves the transfer of funds from one budget category to another.

To request a budget modification, grant recipients shall submit the revised budget detail and budget summary along with a brief narrative explaining the reasoning for the modification to Jacob Hollnagel, at (608) 266-5195 or jacob.hollnagel@dpi.wi.gov. The DPI will notify grant recipients of the approval or denial in writing within 30 days.

Report Requirement

Award recipients will be required to submit an end of year report. The report request will ask awardees to summarize and provide evidence of what impact the planned activities had on the stated goals and objectives. The DPI will provide grantees the report information at a later date and post the requirements to the webpage at: <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/programs/prmg>.

Review Process

DPI staff and outside reviewers will rate each of the grant applications using the following rubric. Following the review, the DPI will communicate the results to the grant contact person or the grant coordinator identified in the application. If there are issues or concerns for grants that are awarded, these will need to be addressed by applicants before the DPI issues the grant award.

2016-17 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Evaluation Rubric

Following is the rubric that will be used to evaluate grant proposals. The rubric is included here to serve as a proposal development guide for applicants. Scoring will be rated as strong (S), average (A), weak (W) or unable to be graded (U). Each proposal will be read and rated by a team consisting of DPI staff and external stakeholders.

Grant Requirements	Strong (S)	Average (A)	Weak (W)	Unable to Grade (U)
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: Describe the identified need for the plan and how the plan will enable educators to address student performance gaps. Describe the ongoing job-embedded professional development directed at improving student learning. Cite relevant local data/information to justify the program funding.	Clear and succinct description of need.	General description of need.	Need unclear or beyond the scope of the grant.	No description of need in application.
	Comprehensive data analysis and other relevant information support the identified need.	Some relevant local data/information cited.	Weak data/background information.	No data or background information cited.
	Program description includes a clear plan for job-embedded professional development to support student learning.	Job-embedded professional development included, but support for student learning is unclear.	Job-embedded professional development is mentioned, but implementation is unclear.	Job-embedded professional development is not included in the plan.
GOAL(S)/ OBJECTIVES: Do the program goals and objectives directly relate to educators' professional growth?	Goals stated clearly and make direct connection to professional growth.	Goals describe in general terms how professional growth will occur, based on some data.	Goals provide a very limited connection to professional growth.	No goals or objectives are identified in the application.
ACTIVITIES: List the objectives and activities that will be used to meet the stated goals.	Objectives listed include a well-developed timeline and have activities that are strategically connected to overall program goals.	Objectives are listed but are not part of a well-developed timeline, nor are they strategically connected to the overall program goals.	Objectives and activities are not listed for each stated goal. Those listed make vague connection to stated goal.	No activities or objectives listed for stated goals.

COLLABORATION: Describe how the collaboration within the consortium supports the plan.	Clear and specific description of how, when and what collaboration within the consortium will enhance the plan.	General description of how collaboration within the consortium will enhance the plan is provided.	Vague assertion of collaboration within the consortium with no indication of how it will enhance the plan.	Lack of information as to how the consortium will collaborate in support of the plan.
TEACHER INVOLVEMENT: To what extent are teachers involved in the program development and activities?	Teachers were directly involved in developing the program.	Teachers were minimally involved in the program development.	The needs of teachers and initial educators were taken into consideration during program development.	No evidence of teacher involvement or consideration in development of the program.
	Teachers are heavily involved in program activities.	Teachers are somewhat involved in program activities.	Teachers are minimally involved in program activities.	No evidence that teachers are involved in the program activities.
PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY: Describe the plan for continuing the program beyond the grant period.	The proposal describes a clear plan to continue the program beyond the one-year grant period. Resources to continue the program are addressed.	The proposal describes in general terms how the program will continue beyond the one-year grant period.	Vague description is provided for continuing the plan beyond the one-year grant period.	No description for plan to continue the program beyond the grant period is included.
EVALUATION: State the methods used to evaluate the plan in terms of educator professional growth.	Evaluation of the plan is specific, based on data, and is directly related to educator professional growth.	General evaluation strategies are used to determine professional growth.	Evaluation strategies are not appropriate and do not examine professional growth.	No plan to evaluate the grant program is included in the application.
DPI PRIORITIES: Does the plan include any of the nine districts identified in Wisconsin's Teacher Equitable Access Plan? To what extent does the proposed plan include support for and/or alignment of the PDP and EEP processes?	Yes			No
	Program description includes a clear plan for supporting and aligning of the PDP and EEP processes in relation to the overall program.	Support for and/or alignment of the PDP and EEP processes is included, but is not related to the overall program.	There is mention of support for the PDP and/or EEP processes.	Support for neither the PDP nor EEP process is included in the plan.